



Daily Report

West Europe

FBIS-WEU-96-050
Wednesday
13 March 1996

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Daily Report

West Europe

FBIS-WEU-96-050

CONTENTS

13 March 1996

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

NATO: Solana on U.S., WEU, Russia, Bosnia [Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 12 Mar] 1

INTER-EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

EU: Santer Envisions 'Federation of Nation States' [PRESS ASSOCIATION] 3
 EU: IGC To Consider Funding of Trans-European Networks [Paris LA TRIBUNE DESFOSSES 12 Mar] 3
 EU: Report Uncovers Massive Fraud in Agriculture Budget [London INDEPENDENT 11 Mar] 4

BELGIUM

Belgium: Dehaene Views Britain's White Paper on Europe [London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 13 Mar] 5

UNITED KINGDOM

UK: Rifkind Views 'Critical Dialogue' With Iran [FCO On-Line WWW 12 Mar] 6
 UK: Rifkind Speaks on 'Partnership of Nations' Vision [FCO On-Line WWW 12 Mar] 7
 UK: Rifkind Opposes Expanding of EU Majority Voting [PRESS ASSOCIATION] 9
 UK: Government Opposes Giving More Power to EU [PRESS ASSOCIATION] 10
 UK: Politics of Referendum on Single Currency Discussed [INDEPENDENT 13 Mar] 11
 UK: Trimble Welcomes Clinton's Call For IRA Cease-Fire [Dublin Radio] 13
 UK: Loyalists Stress Peace, But 'Ready to Strike' IRA [PRESS ASSOCIATION] 13
 UK: Comments From Adams, Bruton, Taylor as Tension Rises [PRESS ASSOCIATION] 14

IRELAND

Ireland: IRA, Hume, Adams Meeting Assessed [AN PHOBLACHT 7 Mar] 15

GERMANY

Germany: CDU's Roth Says Not Meet EMU Criteria [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 11 Mar] 18

FRANCE

France: Juppe Envisions EU of 'Different Levels' [Paris Radio] 19
 France: Relations With Algeria 'Normal' [AFP] 19

SPAIN

Spain: Aznar on Points of Agreement With Nationalists [ABC 10 Mar] 20

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland: Cotti Interviewed on OSCE Chairmanship [HANDELSBLATT 8-9 Mar] 25

TURKEY

Turkey: Baykal Reportedly To Oppose Hammer Force [HURRIYET 10 Mar] 27
 Turkey To Avoid Inviting Iran to Conference on Bosnia [CUMHURİYET 3 Mar] 27
 Turkey: Yilmaz on Customs Union, Greece, RP [Ankara TV] 28
 Turkey: Ecevit Interviewed on Coalition, Iran [Istanbul TV] 29

NATO: Solana on U.S., WEU, Russia, Bosnia

BR1303095696 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian
12 Mar 96 p 9

[Report on interview with NATO Secretary General Javier Solana by Ole Mathismoen in Brussels; no date given: "Europe Still Needs the United States"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Brussels — We must learn from Bosnia. It is only when Europe and the United States shoulder to shoulder that we are strong enough to tackle a such crises.

NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, a convinced European and long-time advocate of more extensive foreign and security policy cooperation in the EU, said in an exclusive interview with AFTENPOSTEN that he did not doubt for a moment that Europe would require the strong involvement of the United States for the foreseeable future.

For the time being at least Europe cannot tackle major crises without the United States, he claimed.

"The war in Bosnia is a good example, and one we should learn from. When we stand together we are very strong and can handle almost anything. I would go so far as to say that the issue of whether Europe and the United States are on the same wavelength is curcial to whether the result will be success or fiasco," Solana said.

Until December of last year he was Spain's foreign minister. He was proposed as a compromise candidate for the NATO post after the major powers in the alliance had disagreed for months about who should succeed Willy Claes. The 53-year-old socialist, a former professor of physics and NATO opponent, has been received with open arms. Paris, Bonn, Washington, and London all seem satisfied. But Solana is not a man to throw big words around carelessly. He is cautious — especially when the relationship with Russia is touched on.

[Mathismoen] U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke recently spoke very harshly about Europe's inability to handle crises. Why can Europe not even ensure peace between Turkey and Greece?

[Solana] A common European foreign policy is a very recent creation. The EU countries have taken the first steps, but there is still a long way to go. Bosnia demonstrated that it is difficult to get it to work, but also that we can do it when the United States and Europe work together.

[Mathismoen] Will the Western European Union (WEU) be able to become a European peace police, as several European governments have proposed?

[Solana] The issue of the WEU's relationship to the EU will be clarified at the EU's Intergovernmental Conference. The WEU might gradually develop into something which could take on peacekeeping operations and could at some time in the future become the practical instrument of a European defense arm. But we must avoid developing a duplicate. NATO should continue to be the most important instrument for European security. The two organizations will be separate, but not separated from each other.

[Mathismoen] Because Norway is not a member of the EU, our politicians are at times only observers of the debate on the future security order in Europe. Norwegians are also concerned about NATO's increasing orientation toward Central and Southern Europe. Is there reason for concern?

[Solana] No, I do not think there is any reason for Norway to worry about what is happening. Even if Norway is outside the EU, there are important and close contacts. And even if after its summit in 1994 NATO began closer contacts with Central and Southern Europe, NATO's obligations to Norway will remain in place as always. I am very grateful for Norway's loyal involvement, especially in the IFOR [Implementation Force] operation in Bosnia.

[Mathismoen] Many Norwegians also fear the crass Russian pronouncements objecting to military exercises in northern Norway and NATO's plans for expansion.

[Solana] These reactions must be analyzed in light of the fact that there is a presidential election campaign in Russia. We have to distinguish between what is election campaign and what is actual Russian policy. We should bear in mind that Russia is now participating fully in IFOR and has close contacts with NATO through the partnership agreement. I think we will be succeed in convincing the Russian people that a NATO expansion does not imply aggressive intent, but is directed simply toward ensuring peace. I do not think that many Russians have understood so far that this is our reason for expanding.

[Mathismoen] Do you think that the presidential election might result in some reversal in the relationship between NATO and Russia?

[Solana] I hope not. I hope and believe that the reforms will continue after the election as well, and that contacts with NATO can be developed further.

[Mathismoen] So you do not view the threats many Russian politicians have made concerning the expansion plans all that seriously?

EU: Santer Envisions 'Federation of Nation States'

*LD1203172396 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1040 GMT 12 Mar 96*

[FBIS Transcribed Text] European Commission President Jacques Santer reassured Britain today that he is not an interfering European overlord hell bent on absorbing the nation into a United States of Europe.

In a nationwide radio phone-in Mr. Santer insisted he was as keen as anyone on protecting cultural diversities and minimising red tape. He was trying to create "a federation of nation states" taking account of national identities.

His appearance on BBC Radio 4's Today programme was deliberately intended to take the wind out of the Euro-sceptics' sails on the day the government White Paper on Europe's future is unveiled.

And in his heavy Franco-German accent Mr. Santer even adapted Harold Wilson's famous phrase to suit the vagaries of the single currency timetable: "Two years is a long time in economics and politics."

Mr. Santer's phone-in was the just the latest phase in a concerted campaign by the Brussels Commission to crack British resistance to the EU by countering Euro-sceptic propaganda.

Today in answer to questions from the public Mr. Santer laughed off tales of Euro-laws on curved cucumbers and bent bananas saying: "We hear so many of these stories here in Brussels — sometimes I don't know whether to laugh or cry."

But there was some ammunition for EU scaremongers — Mr. Santer insisted that the European Union had never been conceived as just a free trade area: "It was always a political project."

Nevertheless he laid into claims of vast Eurocracies, pointing out that the 14,000 strong Commission was smaller than many local authorities in Britain.

And he said Brussels was far less intent on producing laws than Whitehall — four times as many pieces of domestic industrial legislation as EU regulation, with "over-enthusiastic bureaucrats in national capitals" making more of the EU rules than was necessary.

His motto, said Jacques Santer, was "act less, but better", a principle Mr. Major could not argue with as his benchmark for Britain in Europe.

"The richness of Europe lies in its diversity, also in the cultural and political level" he added — another neat phrase to quell the anti-European masses.

On the sensitive issue of a referendum on a single currency, Mr. Santer said it was a matter for every member state to decide for themselves.

And to those arguing that Brussels is run by an unelected elite he pointed out that he had been nominated by elected politicians from 15 member states. And if that wasn't good enough, he was prepared to consider a more democratic election system.

Meanwhile, the smooth running of the single market did require common rules. But they should be the "lightest regulations possible".

It was a performance designed for the most troublesome nation the Commission confronts daily — and one with the power to wreck the European dream unless Brussels overcome the cynics.

Mr. Santer attempted that today — prepared to put up with the inevitable digs at his thick English accent; if it will help convince just one Euro-sceptic that he is a mild-mannered mainstream Luxembourger and not a wild-eyed ogre hijacking national sovereignty. As Mr. Santer as admitted before, he is fundamentally an optimist.

EU: IGC To Consider Funding of Trans-European Networks

*BR1303104496 Paris LA TRIBUNE DESFOSES
in French 12 Mar 96 p 6*

[Report by Marc Paolini: "Funding of Major Infrastructure Networks — Meeting in Turin"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Jacques Santer is seeking to discover the truth about the issue of the trans-European networks. On the initiative of the European Commission president, the question of the funding of these projects which again divided the EU economy and finance ministers meeting in Brussels yesterday will be on the agenda of the heads of state and government when they meet at the Turin summit on 29 March.

This Monday's [11 March] ministerial meeting revealed a high level of disagreement between the community executive and certain member states on the one hand and six other countries, including France, on the other. This disagreement concerns both the need for additional credits to supplement the already earmarked budget (ECU1.8 billion for the period 1996-1999) for these major networks, and the way in which these additional subsidies will be funded. Only a few months ago the EU finance ministers rejected the idea of a massive European loan to collect the money the Commission considers necessary to build the 14 "priority" transport networks agreed on in Corfu in June 1994, as well as

Belgium: Dehaene Views Britain's White Paper on Europe

MS1303102596 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 13 Mar 96 p 4

[Report on interview with Belgian Prime Minister Jean-Luc Dehaene, by Toby Helm, in Dehaene's office, date not given]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Brussels —A photograph which has pride of place in Jean-Luc Dehaene's office sums up the affectionate disdain in which he, as Belgian Prime Minister, holds the British.

It shows the rotund Flemish federalist sitting-next to Lady Thatcher at a ceremony to celebrate achievement of the Channel Tunnel. Thatcher is perched on the edge of her seat while Dehaene is slumping back, fast asleep. "It was the afternoon," he remarked with a shrug.

On the day the British produced a White Paper on Europe containing page after page of Euro-sceptical views diametrically opposed to his own, Dehaene, who will bat for Belgium at the launch of the Intergovernmental Conference in less than three weeks, reacted with similarly lofty, if entirely polite, disapproval.

The 55-year-old Dehaene is no stranger to outbursts of British Euro-scepticism. His chances of succeeding Jacques Delors as EU President was single-handedly shot to pieces by John Major in 1994 because he was far too much of a federalist for the Tories to stomach.

"I understand why John Major did it," said Dehaene. "He had the choice of giving me a job or losing his."

The tone of the White Paper, which staunchly defends the national veto (which Dehaene wants all but abolished) and opposes bringing any justice or home affairs issues under Community control, disappoints rather than angers Dehaene. It shows that same "short thinking" for which he ticked-off Mr Major during his campaign for the EU presidency.

"I said to him that, if you make one concession to Eurosceptics, you will go from one concession to

another. The position afterwards has shown that is the way things happened."

Hence Dehaene's lack of surprise at yesterday's White Paper. With its rejection of more majority voting, more powers for the European Parliament and plans to extend Brussels control over immigration, crime, and asylum policy, it could hardly be more different to that presented to the Belgian Parliament last week.

Dehaene, the Benelux countries' answer to Chancellor Kohl of Germany, will enter into battle with Mr Major once more. He says he gets on well in private with Mr Major.

He will be outspoken about the appalling results of Europe failing to take the chance to give more powers to Europe's institutions. The effect could be a return to nationalism and war in Europe.

The main reason for forming the European Community "to avoid nationalistic confrontations which twice brought Europe to a disaster" — still applies today, Dehaene says. "If you want to avoid a repetition of that in the 21st century, you should not go too easy on that."

Similarly, failure to push ahead with deeper integration, including a single currency, will be devastating. "I do not see how the single market can function in that case."

Dehaene wants policy on border controls, fighting crime and combating drugs to become matters for Brussels rather than between governments all with a right of veto.

On the single currency, Dehaene insisted it would go ahead in 1999, as much as anything because the alternative is too awful to consider.

Dehaene has a reputation as a brilliant politician — a Mr Fixit — in his own country. He will need to be at his very best if he is to bridge the seemingly vast gap between Mr Major and federalists like himself and Kohl.

it is keen to see a dialogue taken forward. A lot of the effort has come from their direction in terms of the principle of dialogue. Where we are highly doubtful is as to the value of it.

UK: Rifkind Speaks on 'Partnership of Nations' Vision

LD1203211696 (Internet) FCO On-line WWW Service in English 12 Mar 96

[Statement by the Foreign Secretary, Malcolm Rifkind in the House of Commons, 12 March 1996] "A Partnership of Nations" — The British Approach to the European Union Intergovernmental Conference 1996 — FCO On-line WWW headline]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] With permission, Madam Speaker, I should like to make a statement on the forthcoming Intergovernmental Conference. Britain has a vision of Europe which is reflected in the White Paper which we are publishing today and which is entitled 'A Partnership of Nations'. We want to see a Europe that respects cultural and political diversity, which only does those things at the European level which need to be done at that level, which is outward-looking, free-trading, democratic and flexible: a partnership of nations working together to advance their national interests. The IGC is, of course, only one means available to us through which we intend to realise our objectives. We shall continue to work tirelessly in all the other fora for the same goal.

Successive British Governments have seen the European Union as a means of safeguarding stability and creating prosperity in Europe. Of course there have been frustrations and controversies. But, overall, the UK has greatly benefited from more than 20 years of membership. So the Government approaches the launch of the Intergovernmental Conference at Turin on 29 March unambiguously committed to our membership of the European Union. We will play a leading role in the Union as one of Europe's biggest and most powerful nations. Our voice is influential. We have helped shape the European Community in the past. Britain was the pioneer of the Single Market. We have been one of the leading advocates of enlargement and of a European Union open to the world.

The Government believes the European Union will only succeed if it respects the integrity of the independent democratic nation states which comprise its membership; and if it is flexible enough to accommodate their political and cultural differences. The Government is totally opposed to a monolithic, centralised, federal Europe.

The Treaty on European Union, like the original Treaty of Rome, calls for an 'ever closer union among the peoples of Europe', (not, let it be noted, among the states of Europe, or among their governments). This aspiration for strengthened co-operation and friendship across the whole of Europe is a noble one, fully shared by the government. But it should not mean an ever closer political union in the sense of an inexorable drift of power towards supra-national institutions, the erosion of the powers of national parliaments, or the gradual development of a United States of Europe. The government rejects that conception of Europe's future. That is why it is crucial that national parliaments remain the central focus of democratic legitimacy. Europe must develop with the instincts of free people in free nations. As the European Union matures it needs a clearer sense of what it is, and of what it should never aspire to be. These principles are closely adhered to in the White Paper.

The Intergovernmental Conference is clearly important to the European Union's future. But it is not the only, or perhaps even the most important, challenge which the Union faces. Outside the Intergovernmental Conference, we must prepare for the enlargement of the Union to the east and south. That will involve the Herculean task of reforming the Community's agricultural and regional policies. Meanwhile, we cannot ignore the urgent need to strengthen Europe's competitiveness and thereby generate new jobs. There will also be hard choices to make on a single currency and on the Union's future financing. These critically important matters do not fall within the scope of the Intergovernmental Conference, though the United Kingdom is developing clear and robust policies in each area.

The Maastricht Treaty came into force little more than two years ago. We agree with the conclusion of the Study Group which was set up to prepare for the IGC that 'the Conference should focus on necessary changes, without embarking on a complete revision of the Treaty'. British objectives such as a major reform of the Common Agricultural Policy do not need Treaty amendment and will be taken forward in other negotiations.

The IGC has yet to begin. In common with other Member States, the government is still considering its detailed approach. We may have further proposals to make as the negotiations proceed. The following represent our specific proposals for this Intergovernmental Conference.

First, Subsidiarity. This is the key to ensuring that the Union concentrates single-mindedly on doing what needs to be done at a European level, and only that.

view must be improved. There is very great concern that the ECJ's interpretations sometimes seem to go beyond what governments intended when laws were framed.

The Government is working up a number of proposals to enable the Court to address these concerns better. These include: strengthening the ability of the Court to limit retrospective application of its judgments; introducing the principle that a member state should only be liable for damages in cases of serious and manifest breach of its obligations; applying national time limits to all cases based on EC laws except where the member state's failure to implement a Directive is in serious and manifest breach of its obligations; an internal appeals procedure; streamlined procedures for the rapid amendment of EC legislation which has been interpreted in a way which was never intended by the Council; an accelerated procedure for time-sensitive cases; and a Treaty provision clarifying the application of subsidiarity in the interpretation of EC laws. The Government will shortly be issuing a Memorandum setting out its proposals in detail.

Ninth, Certain changes to the Council voting system will be necessary if the Union is to continue to function democratically in an enlarged Union. At present, the system of weighted votes is biased against the larger Member States. There is growing acceptance across Europe that a way must be found to address this imbalance. Possible alternatives include changing the number of votes of larger countries so that population is better reflected. What is clear is that the system must not allow countries representing a significant percentage of the EU's population or the major net contributors as a group to be out-voted.

Tenth, As the Union enlarges to as many as 27 members it will be necessary to change the current policy whereby every Member State, however small, has a Commissioner and is responsible for a six-month Presidency. Such a structure would quickly become unworkable in an enlarged Union.

As the White Paper makes clear, there are a number of other specific areas where the Government sees scope for improvements to the Treaty at this IGC, including animal welfare and possible changes to the Common Fisheries Policy as announced by my right hon. the Minister of Agriculture last week. There are many areas where the countries of the Union could and should co-operate more closely in their own national interests, and in the interest of Europe as a whole. But at a time when there is concern about Europe trying to do too much, we do not believe that the rules on Qualified Majority Voting in the Treaty should be changed to make it easier to over-

ride national concerns in areas of particular sensitivity. That is why we will oppose the extension of majority voting at the IGC.

Nor do we favour further harmonisation or the extension of Community competence in the area of employment. The need to create jobs is one of the highest priorities facing the European Union. But jobs cannot be wished into being simply by legislating for them. It is businesses that make jobs. That is why the Prime Minister negotiated Britain's Social Chapter opt-out at Maastricht. I can tell the House that our opt-out is here to stay.

The Government approaches this IGC with confidence and determination. The national interest of this country is the starting point for our approach since for all free nations the national interest can be defined as the collective expression of the democratic process. In many areas, our national interest coincides with that of our European partners and, in those areas, working with our partners enables our collective effort better to achieve our ends. We shall argue constructively for Treaty changes to improve the operation of the Union. We want to strengthen the Treaty so that Europe can face and overcome the challenges ahead and, in particular, so that we can prepare for further enlargement. As I have said, the Conference is only one forum where we shall press for our vision of Europe. There are others and we shall argue robustly in all of them. Britain will be at the heart of the debate about the future of the European Union because it is our future and we can best shape our national destiny by working with our closest neighbours to make a strong and effective partnership of nations.

UK: Rifkind Opposes Expanding of EU Majority Voting

LD1203173296 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 0905 GMT 12 Mar 96

[By Sian Clare, Political Correspondent]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The Government will today set its face against any weakening of the national veto as it publishes a White Paper outlining its stance on the future of Europe.

To the delight of Euro-sceptics, Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind stressed the importance of the nation state and confirmed that ministers would fight against the extension of majority voting into any fresh areas.

The paper, called A Partnership of Nations, will set Britain on a collision course with its European partners, who want to water down the veto to make decision-making easier as the EU enlarges.

Other specific proposals in the document include the need to entrench the principle of "subsidiarity" in the Treaty to ensure the EU concentrates only on doing what needs to be done at a European level.

Britain will also be calling at the summit for improvement to the quality of European legislation and strengthening co-operation on defence, justice and home affairs.

However, the paper makes clear that foreign and defence policy must remain the ultimate responsibility of national governments.

The Government is ready to look at the idea of appointing a figurehead - fully answerable to the Council of Ministers and voicing the collective views of member states - to represent EU foreign policy to the outside world.

Ministers also want to secure changes in the Council of Ministers' voting system to increase "democratic legitimacy" in an enlarged EU.

Britain is also ready to examine changes to the system under which the EU Presidency is rotated every six months among member states.

The Government warned the EU was undergoing a "period of uncertainty and self-doubt".

Europe as a whole had continued to fall behind the best performing countries in terms of international competitiveness and the single market had not yet delivered all possible benefits.

Ministers blamed an "over emphasis" on social regulation which they claimed had led to rigidity in the labour market and intrusive and unnecessary legislation.

There was particular concern over job creation with just eight million new jobs created within the EU over the past 20 years compared with 36 million new jobs in the United States.

The paper referred to the call in the Treaty on European Union for "an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe".

But, in a message which will please Euro-sceptics, it stressed: "It does not mean an ever closer political union in the sense of an inexorable drift of power towards supra-national institutions, the erosion of national Parliaments, and the gradual development of a United States of Europe."

"The Government rejects that conception of Europe's future. We are determined to safeguard the powers and responsibilities of the nation states that are signatories to the Treaty."

The Government stresses that there must be no new powers for the European Parliament and insists the body must not displace the primary role of national Parliaments.

Ministers call for a greater role for national Parliaments in areas such as justice and home affairs.

The document also suggests that proposals from the European Commission be automatically withdrawn if not adopted by a certain deadline and calls for greater use of "sunset clauses" in Community legislation, providing for expiry or automatic review after a fixed period.

The Government calls for improvements to the operation of the controversial Common Fisheries Policy and promises to seek Treaty changes if necessary.

It warns the present system has been unevenly enforced and has failed to overcome the central problem of over fishing in Europe's waters.

The paper also seeks reform of the Common Agricultural Policy to make it liberal, market-driven, free of regulatory quotas, set-aside and other controls.

And ministers will put forward a proposal at the IGC to incorporate the principle of animal welfare into the Treaty and are considering proposing Treaty changes to tackle fraud.

UK: Politics of Referendum on Single Currency Discussed

MS1303121196 London INDEPENDENT in English
13 Mar 96 p 15

[Article by Andrew Marr: 'A Chancellor At The End Of His Tether']

[FBIS Transcribed Text] In the Commons chamber yesterday, John Major was jokey as he was tested by the Opposition about a referendum on the single European currency. But behind the public smiles, one of the worst cabinet of the Major years is brewing; it could yet lead to the resignation of the Chancellor, Kenneth Clarke, and even to the fall of the Government itself.

For weeks now there have been strong hints from Number 10, Conservative Central Office and the Foreign Office that the Government was about to commit itself to a referendum. Opinion in the party, strongly fanned by the Tory press, has been driving in that direction with seemingly unstoppable force. Sir James Goldsmith's threats, though directed towards a wider referendum, have accelerated the process and terrified some Tory backbenchers.

Malcolm Rifkind has been asked to produce a decision to be announced at the Conservative Central Council

to Clarke on the Government bench during yesterday's European statement, seemingly languid, he must surely have been thinking that this is a dangerous game. And so it is. Major seems determined to promise his referendum. Clarke seems determined to go if he does. Of course one of them may blink. If not? Well, that is how governments die.

UK: Trimble Welcomes Clinton's Call For IRA Cease-Fire

LD1203135596 Dublin RTE Radio One Network in English 1300 GMT 12 Mar 96

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The intensive consultations between the parties in the North and the two governments are continuing today. The SDLP [Social Democratic and Labour Party], the Alliance Party, and Democratic Left are having discussions at Stormont with the Northern Secretary Sir Patrick Mayhew. The political activity follows last night's meeting in Dublin between the Ulster Unionist leader David Trimble and the coalition leaders. Here is Michael Fisher of our northern staff.

[Fisher] The Ulster Unionist leader travels to Washington later this week for the St Patrick's Day weekend, where he will meet President Clinton. Speaking in Belfast this morning, David Trimble welcomed Mr. Clinton's call on the IRA to restore its cease-fire. He also spoke about his meeting in Dublin last night with the coalition partners and said he was glad the attorney general had been there to advise on legislation regarding decommissioning. He said he hoped the Tanaiste, Mr. Spring, was not thinking he could surreptitiously help Sinn Fein and the IRA by not having decommissioning legislation in place before the all-party talks. As the intensive consultations involving the parties come to an end tomorrow, Mr Trimble said they had been very rushed and although there had been some progress, there was still a lot of work to be done.

The DUP [Democratic Unionist Party] had a second meeting with the Workers' Party in East Belfast this morning. This afternoon the Northern Secretary, Sir Patrick Mayhew, and Political Development Minister Michael Ancram are due to hold separate meetings with the SDLP and Alliance. Michael Fisher, RTE news, Belfast.

UK: Loyalists Stress Peace, But 'Ready to Strike' IRA

LD1203180596 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1719 GMT 12 Mar 96

[Pull statement of Combined Loyalist Military Command"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] We have taken careful note of the last IRA statement which contains the threat to continue the war for the next 25 years.

Threats of war, or war itself, will not lessen our resolve for Northern Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom so long as the greater number of our citizens require it.

Arrogance and outdated ideology does not impress us and has no place in a modern society.

The IRA must come to terms with the indisputable fact that we, the Unionist people, are the British presence in Northern Ireland and our democratic desire, freely and continually expressed, cannot and will not be changed as has been clearly demonstrated over 70 years by threats, bombs or even death itself.

Have no lessons been learned from the past; are our people, all our people, to be subjected to interminable warfare; must we listen to the cries of our women and children for another lifetime? We must not permit the past to dominate our future.

From a position of confidence, strength and sophistication, we have withstood the recent provocation of IRA bombs on the mainland which have killed our innocent British fellow citizens. These atrocities cannot be permitted to continue without a telling response from this source.

We are poised and ready to strike to effect. We will give blow for blow. As in the past, whatever the cost, we will gladly pay it. Now is the time to draw back from the brink!

We genuinely want peace and we truly desire that wholesome society which all decent people demand. Despite the frustration we all occasionally feel, the democratic process is the only way forward.

Throughout the proceedings of the past 18 months we have been honest, honourable and principled and, having acknowledged the need for sociological change, we have played our part to the full.

Our society has changed, is changing and will continue to change.

Unprecedented dialogue between political parties is taking place and will intensify in the future. New ground

Ireland: IRA, Hume, Adams Meeting Assessed

MSI203152496 Dublin AN PHOBLACHT in English
7 Mar 96 pp 7,8

[Text] interview with Oglagh na hEireann representatives following John Hume and Gerry Adams meeting with IRA leadership]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] AP/IRN [An Phoblacht/Republican News]: Can you give us a flavor of the meeting and the background to it?

IRA: To answer the second part of your question first, the meeting was the result of a direct request from Mr Hume and Mr Adams which we received and acceded to in the period immediately after 9 February, having said that the IRA leadership itself was already considering requesting such a meeting.

As to the meeting, it lasted some hours and was in our view a useful and constructive meeting. Seven of our representatives attended. Both sides took the opportunity to outline their respective positions. Substantial areas of concern to both sides were covered. As we noted in our statement acknowledging the meeting, there was a detailed and open exchange of views.

AP/IRN: Was the question of a restatement of the IRA's cessation raised?

IRA: This was of course a matter which both men were concerned to explore. They have both made their positions well known in public statements since the meeting took place. They did stress that it was their joint priority to see the peace process restored. We indicated that we shared their desire to see the peace process restored, but that this must mean, from our perspective, the establishment of a meaningful and viable process.

AP/IRN: Can you be more specific?

IRA: Let me refer you here to our statement in the wake of the meeting. We said then we pointed out to Mr Hume and Mr Adams that the failure by the British government to put in place inclusive negotiations free from preconditions, the British abuse of the peace process over 18 months and the absence of an effective and democratic approach capable of providing an irrevocable momentum towards a just and lasting peace in Ireland were the critical elements which led to the failure, thus far, of the Irish peace process. Let me stress here that any restoration of the peace process requires that these three critical failings be corrected. Without that there can be no meaningful or viable process. Let us also be crystal clear on the question of preconditions. The British government, or for that matter any other party to this situation, cannot attempt to reserve for itself the right or the luxury to seek to impose preconditions or tests on any

other party's participation in peace negotiations. Parties will participate on the basis of their mandate and on that alone. Attempts to impose as preconditions the Mitchell report recommendations, attempts to impose decommitment, attempts to impose acceptance of the so-called 'principle of majority consent' or unionist veto, attempts to impose this, that or the other principle as preconditions are a nonsense. No one can limit the agenda for peace negotiations nor can they be allowed to constrain or constrict any party's position through the imposition of preconditions. Obviously everything should be discussed but for British government ministers or appointees, who have never had a single Irish vote cast for them, to impose such preconditions is utterly unacceptable.

AP/IRN: Are you saying that, preconditions aside, the IRA has not ruled out the possibility of another cessation?

IRA: Those are your choice of words, not mine. What we are saying should not be misunderstood. If we are going to resolve the conflict in Ireland what is required is a genuine peace settlement brought about through inclusive negotiations without preconditions.

Let's cast our minds back to 1994. What in effect informed our decision to take our August initiative was the belief that the potential existed for the creation of a viable peace process.

To realise a settlement, however, required a British good faith engagement with the establishment of inclusive peace negotiations free from preconditions and an effective Irish democratic strategy, led by Dublin and supported by others, which was capable of providing the dynamic essential for moving the situation forward.

We have in our previous answer attempted to paint up what appear to us to be three critical areas where the conditions for a viable peace process, which is capable of taking us towards an inclusive negotiated settlement, are simply not in place.

To put it another way, we see the necessity for armed struggle because given current political conditions there is not the necessary dynamic to move us all away from conflict and towards a lasting peace on the basis of a viable process which by its nature ensures that the core issues at the heart of the conflict are addressed and resolved.

Let us return here also to our statements of 9 February and 14 February. We pointed out then that where justice is denied and where democracy is denied then conflict is inevitable. We also pointed out that for so long as Britain persisted in its denial of Irish national and democratic rights then we would continue to assert those

which is capable of addressing all the issue at the heart of the conflict. In effect, a democratic strategy to ensure that through negotiations a just and lasting is achieved.

The only alternative is continued conflict. Everyone in this situation must face up to their responsibilities.

France: Juppe Envisions EU of 'Different Levels'

LD1903121696 Paris France-Info Radio in French
1100 GMT 13 Mar 96

[FBIS Translated Text] In his address to leaders of the parties of the European Democratic Union, Prime Minister Alain Juppe called on the EU to set up a military force of 250,000-350,000 men which would operate within the framework of NATO, within the next few years with or without the Americans. The proposal would be the subject of an intergovernmental conference. Moreover, Alain Juppe outlined the main ideas of his party, the Rally for the Republic, on Europe. Alain Juppe

[Begin Juppe recording] The European Union of tomorrow will undoubtedly consist of different levels. It will be a union of common law, if I may say so, including the current members as well as those who wish to become members. At the heart of this union or this first set, there will be a second smaller but alterable set, formed of a small number of states around France and Germany, two nations which are ready and willing to go further and faster than others on such issues as the currency or defense.

This Europe - enjoying strong solidarity - should not be synonymous with a union à la carte where each one would choose from the community's menu what suits him, leaving to others the burden of obligations that would not suit him. [end recording]

France: Relations With Algeria 'Normal'

BR1203151596 Paris AFP in French
1400 GMT 12 Mar 96

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Paris, 12 Mar (AFP) - "France and Algeria have 'normal relations' which allow a visit by the French foreign minister to that country," Foreign Ministry Deputy Spokesman Yves Doutriaux announced.

"Our relations with Algeria are normal. Foreign Minister Herve de Charette met his Algerian counterpart in Paris in January. There are no objections in principle to a visit by the minister to Algeria. However, no date has been fixed yet," Mr. Doutriaux added. [passage omitted]

[Aznar] I do not need to receive any suggestion, because I am fully aware of what my place, my role, my task, and my responsibility is, and that Spain's interest depends on a stable government and a legislative term as long as possible, which, as well as setting the political timetable under way, will tackle the economic reforms which the country needs.

[San Sebastian] Those reforms aimed at meeting the conditions for convergence will demand sacrifices. Will an unstable government, such as that which will necessarily emerge from this election, be able to carry out the necessary reforms to achieve this and accept the corresponding costs?

[Aznar] If things go well, the government will be strong and able to tackle that process. And there are no exclusions there: Either the country as a whole meets the requirements and is able to catch the boat of Europe, or no part of the country will be able to do so. That is something that concerns us all and which must lead to a stable majority, because the money markets scent out instability immediately and act accordingly. It would be extremely bad for Spain, for its development prospects and for its chances of creating jobs for there to be instability.

[San Sebastian] If you are finally invested, how long will the legislative term last?

[Aznar] I will do my utmost to ensure that it is four years of fruitful government.

[San Sebastian] And if you had to repeat the election in August, would the People's Party win it?

[Aznar] Certainly, but let us not make the country undergo that test.

Conditions for Pact

[San Sebastian] Right now, do you believe in an agreement?

[Aznar] I believe that we will all accept our responsibility and that the only possible government formula involves the People's Party.

[San Sebastian] For their part, the Catalan nationalists have called for gestures, actions, and statements to counter those made over the past few months, which they deem insulting for Catalan nationalism. Are you prepared to give them satisfaction?

[Aznar] What I believe is that we should all do positive things in this new stage which has begun for Spain, and I am prepared to do so. Everybody has some grievance and some wound; so do I. Really astonishing reception committees have been organized for me in some corners of Catalonia, and the CiU [Convergence and Union]

youth have written really insulting pamphlets about me, but all that must be forgotten. Everything. The important thing is that the responsibility of all those who must accept the situation should work, and work well. [answer ends]

(Aznar stands up and goes in search of a duly marked and underlined copy of the People's Party program and some newspaper clippings)

I read in a headline of 28 July: "Aznar promises dialogue with Catalonia even if he wins with an absolute majority."

[San Sebastian] You also said three days before the election, in an interview which I myself conducted with you, that you would not accept the attitude of those who said: "Either give me 300 billion pesetas, or I will not play."

[Aznar] It is natural for those things to be said when you are competing for votes. When a share of the poll is being fought for, those remarks are natural. What the Spanish people have said now is to be able to accept the message. Why did I say that, even if I had a majority, I would practice a policy of dialogue and integration? Because I know very well that there are historical circumstances which concern the personality of Catalonia and other communities, as well as processes of meeting between political forces, which it is necessary to integrate and which the Constitution did a great deal to integrate. Now an extraordinary opportunity is opening up to create an intelligent meeting between the People's Party and CiU in Catalonia, between the People's Party and the PNV [Basque Nationalist Party] in the Basque Country, or between the People's Party and the Canary Islands Coalition in the Canary Islands. A historic opportunity is opening up, and I have always known this and have always been prepared to take it. Now that the Spanish people have so clearly given us the message that we should reach agreement and start governing, I believe that that is what we should do, and I am doing so in an absolutely open spirit and without looking back, but I stress that we should also learn from the previous legislative term.

Basic Agreements

[San Sebastian] To what are you referring?

[Aznar] I wish to remind the Socialists of the offer which I made in the investiture debate of institutional agreements, of maintaining basic agreements on the antiterrorist struggle and on foreign policy: That we all voted in favor of Maastricht and helped the European Council presidency; that we all drew up a joint Spanish

which I have made of acknowledging the results from the institutional viewpoint, I objectively believe that that there are more points of agreement than of disagreement. If we add to this the fact of the polls' verdict and the responsibility which each has to share government decisions — I am not prejudging the formula here — we understand what Spain's needs are, and are able to take the historic opportunity of the meeting with which we are presented, I believe that things can and should turn out well. For my part, I will do my utmost to make this the case.

Historic Meeting

[San Sebastian] Since you speak of that historic possibility of meeting, is it possible that this understanding between the national center-Right and the nationalist center-Right may harden into a more stable long-term relationship, after the manner of that achieved with the regionalist groups in Navarre or Valencia?

[Aznar] Let us not lay down such long-term aims. It is necessary to go for specific aims. There is a historic operation with respect to those singular realities, especially the Catalan and Basque realities, which is the possibility of meeting and serving that historic opportunity is something that encourages us enormously. To serve it by adding to it the normality of democratic change, as a sign and expression of our democracy's progress, is a situation which, while aware of the difficulties, I greatly wish to tackle.

[San Sebastian] Is that understanding essential to defeat the left at the polls?

[Aznar] We have already defeated the left. The fact is that the understanding is necessary from the viewpoint of the voters and desirable from the historical viewpoint.

[San Sebastian] Do you deem yourself able to persuade the nationalists to enter the government?

[Aznar] I will not influence the formulas for giving Spain a stable government with any kind of personal preference. Things have only just begun and must be allowed to proceed normally.

[San Sebastian] And do your nationalist interlocutors have the same frame of mind?

[Aznar] I hope so. I understand their messages and their speeches, but what interests me most is our being able to understand the voters' decision in the end.

[San Sebastian] Would the People's Party be prepared to give the nationalists the speakership of one of the chambers?

[Aznar] I will say nothing, because I do not wish to influence the negotiating process, but I am prepared

for the standing committees both of the Congress [of Deputies], where there is no absolute majority, and of the Senate, where there is, to reflect the existing plurality.

[San Sebastian] What would be your message to the CiU electorate today?

[Aznar] That I am absolutely convinced that we can be loyal and very useful partners for the well-being of Catalonia and Spain.

[San Sebastian] And the PNV's electorate?

[Aznar] The same.

[San Sebastian] Are you prepared to make concessions to the PNV with respect to the struggle against terrorism?

[Aznar] I am prepared to reach agreement, and the policy of pacts consists, as far as I am concerned, in accepting that I am not going to be able to implement my whole government program. The aim is to seek the points of agreement with the others' programs, and I repeat that I believe that there are more points of agreement than of disagreement, and that that should result in specific action and stable agreements. It is a matter not of making or not making concessions but of accepting that one will not be able to do everything that one would like.

Election Promises

[San Sebastian] Will you be able to keep at least your campaign's three main promises; that is, lowering taxes, the six-month military service, and that great social pact for employment?

[Aznar] Yes, I would very much like to be able to do so, and I believe that those three could fit perfectly into the framework of the majority's cooperation. The social agreement is essential, and, in fact, the social interlocutors have also been able to understand the voters' message, because the dialogue which the country needs now affects us all. I have spoken with everybody, and if things go well, I do not rule out exchanging impressions with them personally soon.

[San Sebastian] Will there be any change in the Catalan People's Party?

[Aznar] No.

[San Sebastian] Will the Generalitat's language policy be an obstacle?

[Aznar] That is matter for the Generalitat of Catalonia. We have always championed the implementation of the

**Switzerland: Cotti Interviewed on OSCE
Chairmanship**

AU1203133096 Duesseldorf *HANDELSBLATT*
in German 8-9 Mar 96 p 9

[Report on interview with Swiss Foreign Minister Flavio Cotti by Ewald Stein in Bern on 7 March: "Neutral Switzerland is Practicing Peace Diplomacy"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Bern — The creation of new democratic structures in ex-Yugoslavia is a mammoth task for the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe]. One country is increasingly moving into the center of attention: Switzerland. Since the beginning of the year, it has held the chairmanship of the OSCE.

Swiss Foreign Minister Flavio Cotti, who will now head for one year the OSCE Council of Ministers, the central body for resolutions and control, attaches special importance to the monitoring of the elections as provided for by the Dayton accord. He sees them as "a milestone in the peace process." In an interview with *HANDELSBLATT*, the minister said that this is why the OSCE mission, which consists of several hundred observers and staffers and is headed by U.S. diplomat Prowick, will use all available means to guarantee the framework conditions for correct elections. Cotti: "But these are only the framework conditions; the elections must be carried out by the country itself."

In the words of the head of the Swiss Department for Foreign Affairs (EDA), which is his correct title, one can even feel certain doubts: "I cannot say whether the psychological after-effects of these years filled with hatred will not impede the creation of these framework conditions."

Cotti believes that there are certain signs of progress in the talks on confidence-building measures and armament control, which are held in Vienna under the auspices of the OSCE and were required also under the Dayton accord: "So this is not where the problems are." The problems are in the elections, in the return of the refugees, for which responsibility does not lie with the OSCE but with the UN high commissioner for refugees, and in reconstruction. The foreign minister said that "secure human rights conditions must emerge as a super-structure."

Foreign Minister Cotti is, of course, aware of the fact that as OSCE chairman one "cannot earn great merits," particularly not in 1996. Rather the contrary is the case. It is in this connection that he points out that more than one and a half years ago, when Bern announced its candidacy for the presidency, it was facing only very few competitors.

Cotti provides a simple sounding explanation for why Bern is particularly committed to the OSCE: Particularly because neutral Switzerland "does not have a lot to do in multilateral foreign policy," one assumed the task of pointing again and again to the OSCE's basic values, to which Switzerland has always felt strongly committed: civic society, human rights, minorities ("Almost every conflict with which we are confronted is also one of minorities"), the constitutional state, and democracy.

Flavio Cotti spots a broad consensus among the Swiss population, which, as everybody knows, voted against UN membership: "The OSCE is an undisputed structure in our country. Even our candidacy for the OSCE presidency, which appeared almost presumptuous considering the traditions of our country, was not criticized by anyone." The OSCE chairmanship bears a secondary aspect that is certainly welcome: Switzerland can officially take the floor in the UN General Assembly on behalf of the OSCE in 1996 and present documents, a right otherwise reserved only to UN full members.

Cotti believes that the wide support among the population is also offering the government more room for political action. After all, if one wants to be an active chairman and set signals for example in the area of preventive diplomacy, which, according to Cotti, must be "a systematic field of action of the OSCE," one "must not always immediately take diplomatic cover."

Regarding the term preventive diplomacy, the foreign minister, however, does not want to comment on the "semantic debates" of the Budapest summit meeting in December 1994, where the former Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] was transformed into the institutionalized OSCE. The final document of Budapest notes that the OSCE should be further developed to the preferred early-warning instrument in conflicts, to conflict prevention, and crisis management in the region "between Vancouver and Vladivostok."

To him the "central question now is the role and the functions of the OSCE in an environment that has changed in terms of security policy." This was particularly true with a view to Chechnya and Bosnia. Cotti: "When you look at things pragmatically, tasks have emerged here for the OSCE of which nobody would have even thought of two years ago."

For Cotti, preventive diplomacy ("I would not read any books about preventive diplomacy") means to try to bring partners closer together in a potential conflict area within the framework of a mission and "with able people," and to conduct dialogue. The objective is to create conditions that prevent the eruption of a violent conflict in the first place. Cotti cites a number of examples where, in his opinion, this was achieved.

Turkey: Baykal Reportedly To Oppose Hammer Force

NC1303092096 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish
10 Mar 96 p 14

[From the "Footnote" column by Ferai Tinc: "Baykal Will Not Support the Government on the Hammer Force"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The new government has been forced to take up very important problems as soon as it began working. One of them is related to Turkey's relations with Iraq. Turkey has to improve its relations with Iraq in a way that will not make the United States uneasy, because Ankara expects Washington to support it on several important issues, including the Kardak [Imia] crisis and the oil pipeline project.

Republican People's Party leader and former Foreign Minister Deniz Baykal has said: "There will be important developments in Iraq. They must be carefully followed." He held talks with Iraqi Minister of Oil 'Amir Muhammad Rashid before he transferred the Foreign Ministry to Emre Gonensay. Baykal and Rashid conferred on the Kurds in northern Iraq.

Deniz Baykal has been reluctant to discuss the details of his meeting. However, speaking at his press conference in Ankara yesterday, Rashid said: "The Kurds are our country's people. We are carrying on a dialogue with them."

The supporters of Democratic Party of Kurdistan [DPK] leader Mas'ud Barzani and Patriotic Union of Kurdistan [PUK] leader Jalal Talabani do not agree that any dialogue exists between the Kurds and Baghdad. In fact, I met one of Mas'ud Barzani's high-ranking officials two days ago. He tried to avoid commenting on the reports that Mukerrem Talabani, who is one of Saddam Husayn's former ministers, is in Irbil at the present time. He only said: "He is a Kurd, so he can enter and leave our region."

The representatives of the other opposition groups in northern Iraq have been worried about the dialogue between the Kurds and Baghdad. They are convinced that the flirtation between the two sides is related to the sale of oil. They believe that the Kurdish side is trying to get a share of the oil that will be sold after agreement is reached on the sale of a limited amount. They also believe that the rapprochement will not pave the way for a long-term reconciliation.

It will be recalled that Iraq has seemed reluctant to sell its oil through the Karkuk-Yumurtalik pipeline in the past. However, Baghdad now seems to believe that selling its oil through Turkey will create an opportunity for Iraq to rejoin the international community. Mas'ud

Barzani will be responsible for the security of the section of the Karkuk-Yumurtalik pipeline in northern Iraq.

Meanwhile, Jalal Talabani believes that he has been ignored. In fact, he has tried to send the following message: "The people in our region should benefit equally from the oil revenues. Otherwise, we may encounter problems." Moreover, he has urged Turkey to support him on the matter. Dr. Abdullatif Rashid, who represents Jalal Talabani in London, said: "Turkey must supervise the distribution of the oil revenue. Neither the DPK nor the PUK should be allowed to control them. Revenue must be distributed to the people through the local administrations."

A UN committee will be responsible for the distribution of the revenue. However, it seems that the Kurds want Turkey to act as an observer to safeguard the rights of all the parties involved.

Turkey's relations with Baghdad will gain momentum. Meanwhile, the Turkish Grand National Assembly [TGNA] will vote on the mandate of the Hammer Force at the end of March. The vote will be difficult for the new government. The Democratic Left Party and the Welfare Party will vote against the mandate. Deniz Baykal has said: "We have opposed the Hammer Force in the past. We will continue this policy. We will not cooperate with the government."

Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz may ask the TGNA to authorize his government to decide on if the mandate should be extended. The government will be able to decide on the mandate if the TGNA agrees.

The intensive diplomatic contacts indicate that Ankara wants to maintain a balance in its relations with Baghdad, the Kurds in northern Iraq, and Washington in return for their support for the struggle Turkey is waging against the Workers Party of Kurdistan.

Turkey To Avoid Inviting Iran to Conference on Bosnia

NC1203143996 Istanbul CUMHURİYET in Turkish
3 Mar 96 pp 1, 17

[Report by Serkan Demirtas: "A Veto Against Iran"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Ankara—Turkey will not invite Iran to attend the conference to be held in mid-March on the modernization of the military forces of the Federation of Bosnia and Croatia. The Turkish Foreign Ministry is reportedly studying several formulas to obstruct Iran's participation, despite the fact that both Iran and Turkey are members of the ICO [Islamic Conference Organization] committee for the reconstruction of Bosnia.

through an international judicial organ. He pointed out that at this stage Turkey and Greece are not agreed on what the problems are. He added: If you cannot agree on what the problems are, then you cannot solve them. Whatever method we choose, we must first agree on the problems. That is not the case now. It is impossible for us to activate mechanisms to solve the problems now because there is no dialogue between us. We must restore the mechanism we started in 1989 but which stopped working due to the internal political changes in the two countries. In other words, we must start a dialogue without preconditions, and on the other hand we must take mutual confidence-building measures.

Yilmaz stressed that the leader of the New Democracy Movement in Greece agrees with him.

The prime minister also emphasized that unless the Cyprus problem is resolved, the Greek Cypriot sector cannot join the EU.

Yilmaz said that he invited Juppe to Turkey, and that President Chirac will arrive in Turkey before autumn.

Yilmaz stressed that Turkey is starting a period where very intensive relations must be conducted within the framework of the EU, that he and Tansu Ciller decided to conduct these relations together, and that when he will not be able to pay certain foreign visits, Ciller will do so.

Replying to another question, Yilmaz said that he was asked if he agrees that the True Path Party (DYP) join the EDU, that he agreed, and that the EDU might vote on the DYP's membership next year.

Yilmaz pointed out that the leaders attending the EDU meeting asked him questions about the Welfare Party (RP). He stressed that the Europeans do not have enough information on this issue. He explained that the leaders who talked to him believe that the RP is like the party in Algeria. He went on to say that he explained to them the differences between Turkey and Algeria. He added: I told them that the democratic tradition in Turkey is far stronger than is believed, and that if the RP wants to lead in bringing changes it must certainly abide by democratic principles. I also told them that the RP and especially the leftist parties increased their votes in the major cities, where they are strong. In other words, I told them that the movement supporting the RP in Turkey is not merely an ultra-conservative movement, that it is also a social movement.

Replying to a question concerning author Yasar Kemal, the prime minister said that he talked with him on the telephone, and also asked the culture minister to get involved. Yilmaz said that at the beginning Yasar Kemal was a bit [word indistinct] and did not want

the sentencing to be postponed. He said that during the telephone conversation he calmed Kemal down. Yilmaz pointed out that the sentence handed down was the ruling of the State Security Court, that the prosecutor who had asked for an acquittal will go to the Court of Appeals, and that the Court of Appeals might annul the sentence.

Asked if, together with this issue, the counterterrorism law will be amended, Yilmaz said: There is no need for an amendment before we get the judiciary's final decision. If all procedures are completed, however, and the Court of Appeals makes its final ruling, then the law must be debated in parliament along those lines. It was we who passed this law in 1991. A serious difference has emerged, however, between our will as the legislators of this law and the current interpretation of the law by the court.

Replying to another question, Mesut Yilmaz denied press reports that there are misunderstandings between him and DYP leader Ciller regarding the appointment of high-level bureaucrats.

Yilmaz said that today he might meet with Albanian President Berisha, the British deputy prime minister, the Czech prime minister, the leader of Greece's New Democracy, and the representative of the German chancellor.

After the EDU meeting, Yilmaz will go to Germany to visit his son, who was taken ill last week. The prime minister is expected to return to Turkey on 14 March.

Turkey: Ecevit Interviewed on Coalition, Iran

TA1303114896 Istanbul SHOW Television in Turkish
2030 GMT 12 Mar 96

[Interview with Bulent Ecevit, leader of Turkey's Democratic Left Party, in the Ankara studio, by Mehmet Ali Birand, in the Istanbul studio, for the "32d Day" program — live]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Birand] The government received a vote of confidence on the basis of the abstentions by Democratic Left Party (DSP) deputies at the Assembly. Although the DSP claims it is in the opposition, it indirectly shares the responsibility of the government. The future of the government also depends on the word of the DSP.

[Ecevit] Good evening. Let me immediately react to your remarks. We did not partake in the responsibility of the government. Our responsibility is to the country, not to the government. As we saw on the screen a while ago [reference to incidents in Istanbul's Gazi quarter], Turkey is facing difficult internal issues. There

This is a U.S. Government publication produced by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

FBIS collects, translates, disseminates, and analyzes foreign open-source information on behalf of the U.S. Government. Its publications may contain copyrighted material. ***Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.***

- Bracketed indicators before the first sentence of each item describe the way in which the material was processed by FBIS.
- Headlines and all bracketed explanatory notes are supplied by FBIS.
- Personal and place names are rendered in accordance with the decisions of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names as adapted by FBIS. Unverified names in radio and television material appear in parentheses and are spelled phonetically; words and phrases in parentheses preceded by a question mark are unclear in the original and deduced from context.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

U.S. Government Customers

For a list of FBIS products, to subscribe to an FBIS publication, or to indicate a change of address contact:

FBIS
P.O. Box 2604
Washington, DC 20013-2604
Telephone: (202) 338-6735
FAX: (703) 733-6042

Non-Government Customers

Subscriptions are available from the National Technical Information Service:

NTIS
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
Telephone: (703) 487-4630
FAX: (703) 321-8547

New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

14 Mar 96